arXiv:hep-th/9111018v1 8 Nov 1991

N=2 COSET COMPACTIFICATIONS WITH NON-DIAGONAL INVARIANTS

G. Aldazabal[1], I. Allekotte[1], A. Font[2]
and C. Núñez[3,*]

[1]*Centro Atómico Bariloche, 8400 Bariloche,*
Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica,
Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas,
and Instituto Balseiro, Universidad Nacional de Cuyo - Argentina

[2]*Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias,*
Universidad Central de Venezuela,
A.P.20513, Caracas 1020-A - Venezuela

[3]*?*

ABSTRACT:

We consider 4-dimensional string models obtained by tensoring N=2 coset theories with non-diagonal modular invariants. We present results from a systematic analysis including moddings by discrete symmetries.

* Work partially supported by CONICET of Argentina, by the Commission of the European Communities under contract No. C 11-0540-M(TT), and by Fundación Antorchas.

1. Introduction

The almost uniqueness of 10-dimensional $SO(32)$ or $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string theory, once thought to be a desirable property for a "theory of everything", has now been swept out by the rapidly growing production of 4-dimensional string theories. Awkward as this may seem however, all these chiral theories in lower dimensions share with the original one all the other features that started the excitement: anomaly freedom, potential for realistic phenomenology and the promise of a finite and consistent theory of quantum gravity.

With all these theories at our disposal the idea of thoroughly studying each of these models seems discouraging. It appears more reasonable instead to try to understand general properties of the different constructions, to find relations among the diverse models, in order to gain a better comprehension of the theory. The present paper aims at this general goal.

One very interesting class of string compactifications was introduced by Gepner [Gepner87], who showed how to obtain (2,2) models by taking tensor products of $N = 2$ minimal models for the internal degrees of freedom. The spectrum of these compactifications has been constructed when A, D or E-type invariants of the $SU(2)$ affine algebra are used[Gepner87,Lutken,LS1,Fuchs]. The $N = 2$ minimal models of the Gepner construction can be replaced by the $N = 2$ coset theories found by Kazama and Suzuki[Kazama], thus increasing the possibilities for the internal part of the compactified string theories. Models obtained by tensoring the simplest CP_m cosets with diagonal invariants (referred to as CP_m diagonal models in the following) have been analyzed in Ref.[Font]. Other cosets have been investigated in Refs. [Bailin,But1,But2,LS2,Sche].

It is then natural to extend the analysis of models based on $N = 2$ cosets to include non-diagonal invariants. Such computation is not only useful for the aim of classifying all string vacua but also as a systematic search of promising phenomenological models. Following this direction we have implemented the computation of the number of generations in CP_m models with different kinds of invariants.

Although a complete classification only exists in the $SU(2)$ case [Capelli], many positive, off-diagonal invariants can be constructed for other algebras [Ber,ALZ,su3,SY1,SY2,dual,Ver]. These include series invariants associated with automorphisms of the affine algebra, invariants obtained by conformal embeddings and invariants obtained by acting with an automorphism of the fusion rules of the extended algebra. In the appendix we have explicitly listed various types of $SU(N)$ invariants, including some that, to our knowledge, have not appeared previously in the literature.

This article is organized as follows. In section 2 we review the basic notions of the Gepner construction as applied to CP_m cosets. In section 3 results are listed and discussed. In section 4 we include moddings by discrete symmetries. Conclusions are presented in section 5. Non-diagonal invariants for the $SU(N)$ affine algebra are described in the appendix.

2. $N = 2$ coset theories and 4-d strings

The $N = 2$ coset theories of Kazama and Suzuki[Kazama] are found by applying the usual GKO construction to a coset $G \times SO(2D)/H$ where $D = \frac{1}{2}\ dim\ (G/H)$. When G/H is a hermitian symmetric space this construction does provide a realization of the $N = 2$ superconformal algebra (SCA). In this note we will only deal with the so-called projective cosets $G/H = CP_m = SU(m+1)/SU(m) \times U(1)$ with central charge given by $c = 3km/(k+m+1)$. In particular, the $N = 2$ minimal models are obtained as CP_1 cosets. A CP_m model at level k is denoted by (m, k) for $m > 1$ and by k for $m = 1$.

States of the SCA are denoted by $|\Lambda, \lambda, \tilde{\Lambda}\rangle$ where $|\Lambda\rangle$ and $|\tilde{\Lambda}\rangle$ are respectively highest weights of G (level k) and $SO(2D)$ (level 1) restricted by unitarity. The weight $|\lambda\rangle$ of the H algebra (level $k+1$) is found by decomposing the $G \times SO(2D)$ representations into irreducible representations of H. For CP_m cosets it is useful to split λ into an $SU(m)$ weight $\hat{\lambda}$ and a $U(1)$ charge q as

$$\lambda = \hat{\lambda} + \frac{q}{m} w_m \qquad (lt)$$

where w_m is the m^{th} fundamental weight of $SU(m+1)$. By definition, $\hat{\lambda} \cdot w_m = 0$ and q is defined mod $m(m+1)(k+m+1)$.

The conformal dimension of a $|\Lambda, \hat{\lambda}, q, \tilde{\Lambda}\rangle$ state is given by

$$h = \frac{1}{2(k+m+1)}[C(\Lambda) - C(\hat{\lambda}) - \frac{q^2}{m(m+1)}] + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Lambda}^2 + n \qquad (cd)$$

where $C(W)$ is the quadratic Casimir of the representation with highest weight W and n is the level at which the state appears. The $U(1)$ superconformal charge of the primary states is given by

$$Q = -\frac{q}{k+m+1} + \sum_{l=1}^{D} \tilde{\Lambda}^l \qquad (sq)$$

The chiral states of the SCA are those primaries with $Q = -2h$. From the above eqs. we see that for $\tilde{\Lambda} = 0$ (and $n = 0$) they must have $\Lambda = \lambda$. Likewise, there are anti-chiral states with $Q = 2h$, whose weights are conjugate to those of the chiral states.

Kazama and Suzuki[Kazama] showed how to generalize the Gepner construction to obtain modular invariant, space-time supersymmetric 4-d heterotic strings in which the internal $c = 9$, $N = 2$ theory is given by a tensor product of $N = 2$ coset theories. For a given sector, say the right one, we denote the internal product of r cosets by

$$\otimes_{i=1}^{r} \; |\Lambda_i, \hat{\lambda}_i, q_i, \tilde{\Lambda}_i\rangle \qquad (ten)$$

The complete state is obtained by appending the space-time part to (ten) and by coupling it to the corresponding expression for the left sector. We now review briefly the basic elements of the heterotic construction which imposes restrictions on the possible quantum numbers of the states.

To describe the generalized GSO projection that guarantees space-time supersymmetry it is useful to represent the right part of a given state by a vector

$$V_R = (\tilde{\Lambda}_0; q_1, \cdots, q_r; \tilde{\Lambda}_1, \cdots, \tilde{\Lambda}_r) \qquad (vr)$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda}_0$ is the $SO(2)$ weight that gives the space-time properties of the state. V_L has a similar expression but with $\tilde{\Lambda}_0$ an $SO(10) \subset E_6$ weight that gives the gauge properties of the state. We also define the scalar product

$$V \cdot V' = \sum_{i=0}^{r} \; \tilde{\Lambda}_i \tilde{\Lambda}'_i \; - \; \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{q_i q'_i}{2\eta_i (k_i + m_i + 1)} \qquad (ps)$$

where $\eta_i = m_i(m_i + 1)/2$, and the vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0 &= (\bar{s}; \eta_1, \cdots, \eta_r; s_1, \cdots, s_r) \\ \beta_i &= (v; 0, \cdots, 0; \cdots, v, \cdots) \quad (v \text{ in the } i^{th} \text{ position}) \end{aligned} \qquad (bet)$$

where $s, \bar{s}$ and v respectively stand for the highest spinor, anti-spinor and vector weights of the appropriate SO groups.

The generalized GSO projection consists of imposing

$$\begin{aligned} 2\beta_0 \cdot V_R &= \text{odd integer} \\ 2\beta_i \cdot V_R &= \text{even integer} \end{aligned} \qquad (GSO)$$

Modular invariance forces the left vector V_L to be related to V_R through

$$\tilde{V}_L = V_R + n_0\beta_0 + n_i\beta_i \qquad (condlr)$$

where $\tilde{V}_L$ is obtained by adding a vector $(v; 0, \cdots, 0; 0, \cdots, 0)$ to V_L. The $SU(m+1)$ and $SU(m)$ left and right weights of each block are correlated according to an invariant of

these algebras. In this note we will use $SU(m+1)$ invariants given by series that occur at generic level as well as exceptional invariants that occur at particular levels. These types of invariants are described in the appendix. For $SU(m)$ we will only use the diagonal invariant and postpone the more general case for future work.

The massless spectrum of the resulting heterotic compactification consists of the supergravity and Yang-Mills multiplets plus chiral multiplets transforming as 27, $\overline{27}$ or 1's under the observable E_6. We are mainly interested in computing the number of 27 and $\overline{27}$'s. This is most easily done by looking at the scalar component that transforms as a 10 of $SO(10)$. For the right sector we then need states with $h^R_{int} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $Q^R_{int} = -1$. For the left part we need $h^L_{int} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $Q^L_{int} = -1$ ($Q^L_{int} = 1$) for 27's ($\overline{27}$'s). Recall that under $SO(10) \times U(1)$ a 27 decomposes as $27 = 16_{\frac{1}{2}} + 10_{-1} + 1_2$.

Only chiral states in the sub-theories can produce tensor states with $h_{int} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $Q_{int} = -1$ whereas for $Q_{int} = 1$ only anti-chiral states contribute. Generations (anti-generations) are thus obtained by combining right chiral and left chiral (anti-chiral) states according to the rules explained above.

To avoid multiple counting of states it is necessary to take into account possible field identifications [Gepner89]. These might appear due to the existence of a proper external automorphism σ acting on the affine algebras in the coset construction. Under this automorphism Λ transforms as

$$\sigma(\Lambda) = kw_1 + a(\Lambda) \qquad (siglam)$$

where w_1 is the 1st fundamental weight of $SU(m+1)$ and a is the Coxeter rotation acting on the fundamental weights as

$$a(w_i) = w_{i+1} - w_1 \qquad (Cox)$$

$\hat{\lambda}$ transforms in a similar way with k replaced by $(k+1)$. The $U(1)$ charge transforms as

$$\sigma(q) = q + (k+m+1) \qquad (sigq)$$

The effect of σ on $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is to exchange the singlet with the vector weight and the spinor with the anti-spinor weight. The order of σ is $m(m+1)$.

This automorphism may act on the left and right sectors independently. However, if the modular coefficients are invariant under a certain subgroup of σ transformations

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma^\alpha(\Lambda),\sigma^\beta(\Lambda')} = \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda,\Lambda'} \qquad (modcoef)$$

the following field identifications

$$|\Lambda,\hat{\lambda},q,\tilde{\Lambda}\rangle_R\otimes|\Lambda',\hat{\lambda}',q',\tilde{\Lambda}'\rangle_L= \\ |\sigma^\alpha(\Lambda),\sigma^\alpha(\hat{\lambda}),\sigma^\alpha(q),\sigma^\alpha(\tilde{\Lambda})\rangle_R\otimes|\sigma^\beta(\Lambda'),\sigma^\beta(\hat{\lambda}'),\sigma^\beta(q'),\sigma^\beta(\tilde{\Lambda}')\rangle_L \qquad (ident)$$

are necessary. Notice that $\alpha=\beta$ mod m must be required since we are considering the diagonal invariant for $SU(m)$.

To clarify the issue of field identifications let us consider a coset model built up of two theories coupled through invariants satisfying (modcoef) for some α_i,β_i. If a state

$$[|\ \Lambda_1,\hat{\lambda}_1,q_1,\tilde{\Lambda}_1\rangle\ |\ \Lambda_2,\hat{\lambda}_2,q_2,\tilde{\Lambda}_2\rangle]_R\otimes[|\ \Lambda_1',\hat{\lambda}_1',q_1',\tilde{\Lambda}_1'\rangle\ |\ \Lambda_2',\hat{\lambda}_2',q_2',\tilde{\Lambda}_2'\rangle]_L \qquad (state)$$

is in the spectrum we know from (condlr) that $(i=1,2)$

$$q_i'-q_i=\frac{n_0(m_i+1)m_i}{2}\ \text{mod}\ m_i(m_i+1)(k_i+m_i+1) \qquad (qq)$$

Let us now transform the right (left) sector of the above state (state) by the action of $\sigma^{n_1\alpha_1}$, $\sigma^{n_2\alpha_2}$ ($\sigma^{\bar{n}_1\beta_1}$, $\sigma^{\bar{n}_2\beta_2}$) to obtain a new state

$$[\sigma^{n_1\alpha_1}\ |\ \Lambda_1,\hat{\lambda}_1,q_1,\tilde{\Lambda}_1\rangle\sigma^{n_2\alpha_2}\ |\ \Lambda_2,\hat{\lambda}_2,q_2,\tilde{\Lambda}_2\rangle]_R\otimes \\ [\sigma^{\bar{n}_1\beta_1}\ |\ \Lambda_1',\hat{\lambda}_1',q_1',\tilde{\Lambda}_1'\rangle\sigma^{\bar{n}_2\beta_2}\ |\ \Lambda_2',\hat{\lambda}_2',q_2',\tilde{\Lambda}_2'\rangle]_L \qquad (eqstate)$$

This new state will have the same Q and h as the original one and will be allowed by the modular invariant due to (modcoef). Thus (eqstate) will be in the spectrum if $\sigma^{n_i\alpha_i}(q_i')-\sigma^{\bar{n}_i\beta_i}(q_i)$ satisfy condition (qq) with some n_0' instead of n_0. Comparing both sets of equations and using $\sigma^n(q_i)=q_i+n(k_i+m_i+1)$ with $n<m_i(m_i+1)$ leads to the conditions

$$(n_i\alpha_i-\bar{n}_i\beta_i)(k_i+m_i+1)=(n_0'-n_0)\frac{m_i(m_i+1)}{2}\ \text{mod}\ m_i(m_i+1)(k_i+m_i+1)\ \ (cond1)$$

which in turn imply

$$(\frac{n_1\alpha_1-\bar{n}_1\beta_1}{m_1(m_1+1)}+t_1)(k_1+m_1+1)=(\frac{n_2\alpha_2-\bar{n}_2\beta_2}{m_2(m_2+1)}+t_2)(k_2+m_2+1) \qquad (cond2)$$

with t_1,t_2 integers.

Hence, if conditions (modcoef), (cond1) and (cond2) are met, state (eqstate) is also allowed. As these conditions do not depend on the particular state we started with, states (state) and (eqstate) should be identified in order to avoid a multiple counting. Or, equivalently, the partition function must carry a factor of $\frac{1}{M}$ [Gepner89], where M, the

multiplicity of all the states, can be deduced from the above formulae. The extension of the previous result for the case of r theories is achieved by considering theories in pairs.

All but one of the invariants considered by us (namely, the series G invariant for $SU(4)$, k odd) verify the relation

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(\Lambda),\sigma(\Lambda')} = \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda,\Lambda'} \qquad (invdiag)$$

In this case, the field identification (ident) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$ is required. If the invariant possesses further symmetries, such as

$$\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(\Lambda),\Lambda'} = \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda,\Lambda'} \qquad (invd)$$

new identifications have to be considered.

As an example, consider the tensoring of two Gepner models. For $m_i = 1$ condition (cond1) can always be fulfilled. $SU(2)$ invariants satisfying (invd) are D_{even}, E_7 and E_8, with $k_i = 0$ mod 4. Using these invariants for both blocks gives a multiplicity factor of 8, as can be seen by inspecting the values of n_i, $\bar{n}_i$ for which equation (cond2) can be satisfied.

3. Results

We have computed the number of E_6 generations N_{27} and antigenerations $N_{\overline{27}}$ for tensor products of CP_m coset models having at least one non-minimal block and admitting at least one non-diagonal invariant of the types described in the appendix. These numbers have been obtained by explicitly constructing massless states in the tensor theory as explained in section 2. As a check on our algorithm we analyzed tensor products with $c = 6$ and verified that they correspond either to the $K3$ manifold or to the torus. Results for tensor models with $c = 9$ are presented in Table 1 (the numbering of models follows that of Ref.[Font]).

The net number of generations, $N_{gen} = |N_{27} - N_{\overline{27}}|$, varies between 0 and 360. Similarly as in Refs. [Lutken,Fuchs,Font,LS2,schya] most values of N_{gen} are multiple of 12, 18 or 8. A few other models, which will be described in the next section, present a lower common divisor. Models with 0 generation are also numerous, they add up to 72, out of 357 models listed. Those with $N_{27} = N_{\overline{27}} = 21$ actually correspond to compactifications on the manifold $K_3 \times T$ as observed in Ref.[Lutken].

For minimal models with A-D-E invariants and for CP_m cosets with diagonal invariants the superpotential W which defines the corresponding Calabi-Yau manifold is

known[VW,Mar,GVW,GepnerW,LVW]. Given the polynomial W the net number of generations can be found using a formula derived by Vafa [Vafa]. For the models involving diagonal invariants in the non-minimal blocks we have computed N_{gen} from the Landau-Ginzburg (LG) formulation and found complete agreement with the explicit calculations.

The LG formulation of $N = 2$ models also allows to demonstrate relations among theories. Some known [GVW,Schwarz,Font] equivalences are $10_E = 1_A 2_A$, $28_E = 1_A 3_A$, $4_D = 1_A 1_A$, $(2,2) = 8_D$ and $(m,k)_A = (m-1,k+1)_A(1,\frac{k-m+1}{m})_A$. From the form of the superpotential for diagonal CP_m models we can obtain the following additional equivalences: $(3,4)_A = 6_A 6_D$, $(3,5)_A = 7_A 16_E$, and $(4,7)_A = 4_A 10_A 10_E$. We have checked these relations explicitly by computing their respective spectra. To simplify the presentation, Table 1 does not include models related by the above equivalences. For non-diagonal CP_m models further empirical relations can be established among theories, e.g. $(2,9)_C = (3,4)_C$, $(4,5)_E = (4,5)_C$ and $(3,k \text{ odd})_G = (3,k \text{ odd})_A$.

Given the relation between CP_1 minimal theories with A-D-E invariants and modality zero singularities[Mar,VW] it is natural to ask whether similar results apply to the non-diagonal CP_m theories that we have analyzed. More importantly, one would like to know whether these theories admit a LG description. We have only been able to answer this question in the affirmative in a few isolated cases. For example, we find $(3,2)_{D_2} \equiv 1_A 4_D$, $W = x^3+y^3+yz^2$ and $(5,2)_G \equiv 2_A 6_D$, $W = x^4+y^4+yz^2$. In other cases the question has a negative answer. For instance, the $(2,3)_D$ theory has only one chiral field with $Q \geq 1$ and thus the putative LG polynomial would have modality one. But none of the modality one singularities that have been completely classified[Arnold] has the right properties to match those of the $(2,3)_D$ theory. For generic theories we claim, without rigorous proof, that a quasihomogeneous superpotential cannot be defined.

In a recent work Buturović[But2] has developed a method to compute the number of families for models that do not admit a LG formulation but whose Poincaré polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ is known. For most of our non-diagonal CP_m models we have derived the corresponding $\mathcal{P}$ and checked that the results for N_{gen} using this method agree with the explicit calculations of the massless states. In particular, the equivalences $(2,9)_C = (3,4)_C$ and $(4,5)_E = (4,5)_C$ mentioned above, follow from their corresponding $\mathcal{P}$'s.

4. Moddings by discrete symmetries

The values of N_{gen} displayed in Table 1 are rather large and phenomenologically not viable. However, in general, CP_m models possess discrete symmetries that upon modding

lead to a reduced number of families. For instance, the only known 3-generation model is obtained from the tensor product $1(16_E)^3$ by modding by a $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry [G3]. With this motivation in mind we have included moddings in our analysis.

Discrete symmetries and moddings of tensor products of CP_m cosets have been studied in detail in Ref. [FIQS]. The symmetry group of a tensor product model is given by $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{P}$ where $\mathcal{A} = Z_{k_1+m_1+1} \times \cdots \times Z_{k_r+m_r+1}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ is the permutation group of identical blocks. A new model can be obtained by dividing by any subgroup of $\mathcal{G}$. We will mainly focus on subgroups of $\mathcal{A}$ and now describe the simplest case of modding by a Z_M subgroup.

Z_M is generated by the modding vector

$$\Gamma = (0; \eta_1\gamma_1, \cdots, \eta_r\gamma_r; 0) \qquad (uno)$$

The order M is the least integer such that $M(\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r) = 0 \bmod (k_1 + m_1 + 1, \cdots, k_r + m_r + 1)$. Dividing by Z_M introduces twisted sectors in which

$$\tilde{V}_L = V_R + n_0\beta_0 + n_i\beta_i + 2x\Gamma \qquad (dos)$$

where $x = 0, \cdots, M-1$. Furthermore, the projection

$$\Gamma \cdot (\tilde{V}_L + V_R) = -\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\gamma_i(\bar{q}_i + q_i)}{2(k_i + m_i + 1)} = \text{integer} \qquad (tres)$$

selects the allowed states in each sector.

To preserve supersymmetry Γ must verify the condition

$$2\beta_0 \cdot \Gamma = -\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\eta_i\gamma_i}{(k_i + m_i + 1)} = \text{integer} \qquad (cuatro)$$

There is a finite number of nonequivalent Γ's for a given tensor model. Two moddings Γ_1 and Γ_2 are equivalent if

$$\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 + 2n(0; \eta_1, \cdots, \eta_r; 0) \qquad (cinco)$$

since $2(0; \eta_1, \cdots, \eta_r; 0)$ acts trivially on the spectrum.

We have systematically included all nonequivalent single moddings in combination with non-diagonal invariants. A complete list of results is available on request. We found four models with 4 generations, namely $(3,6)_C 3_A 3_A$, $(3,3)_A 12_A 12_A$, $(2,9)_E 3_A 18_{A,F}$ and $(2,9)_E 6_A 6_{A,F}$. Models with 6 generations are $(2,9)_D (2,9)_D$, $(2,24)_{A,D} 1_A 16_{A,D}$ and $(2,9)_{D,E} 4_A 10_{A,F}$. The remaining models still have 8 or more families.

A generic feature of the results is the fact that for a given model the number of generations obtained through different moddings is always a multiple of a fixed integer. Moreover, replacing diagonal by series invariants does not alter this integer. On the contrary, exceptional invariants may give models with a smaller common factor. As an example consider model $60 : (2,9)(2,9)$. For diagonal and series invariants N_{gen} is always a multiple of 6. Model $60EE$ (with the exceptional $E(2,9)$ invariant) with all possible moddings has a common divisor $D = 2$. Model 190 also possesses $D = 2$. A model with $D = 3$ is $(2,24)_{A,D}1_A16_E$. Some models with a fundamental factor of 4 and 6 also arise. They are 39, 43, 45, 50, 153, 170, 176 and 9, 60, 129, 144, 172 respectively. This sort of quantization property has also been noticed in Refs. $[FIQS, schya]$.

It is also interesting to notice that in most of the cases replacing a diagonal by a series invariant for one block gives the same result as a modding with the diagonal invariant.

5. Conclusions

As a step forward in the program of a systematic analysis of possible (2,2) string vacua, we have extended previous results by considering CP_m coset models with a rather large class of non-diagonal invariants.

A global inspection of Table 1 shows that the results for the net number of generations do not differ appreciably from the ones obtained with diagonal invariants or even from minimal model constructions. This could be surprising in the sense that, in most of the cases, non-diagonal invariants seem to impose severe restrictions on the possible left-right pairings. This is however compensated by the need of considering σ-transformed states, as explained in Section 2.

In order to lower the number of generations, we have modded out by discrete symmetries performing all possible single moddings combined with off-diagonal invariants. We found that for a given model N_{gen} is always multiple of a fixed fundamental number. This is an interesting and useful result since it indicates which models could potentially have 3 families upon further modding by Z_M or permutation symmetries.

As a byproduct of our analysis we found some isomorphisms, e.g. $(4,5)_C = (4,5)_E$, between $N = 2$ CP_m theories. Such equivalences are interesting since they could encode intrinsic properties of the theories.

Directions for future work include the analysis of CP_m cosets with non-diagonal couplings for the $SU(m)$ algebra and the systematic study of other Hermitian symmetric spaces with different types of modular invariants.

Acknowledgements

A.F. wishes to thank: 1) the CAB and the IAFE for hospitality as well as the Universidad de Buenos Aires for financial aid during the time that this work was started; 2) the Centro Científico IBM-Venezuela for the continuous use of its facilities. C.N. thanks the CERN Theory Division and ICTP for hospitality and financial support while some of this work was carried out.

APPENDIX. Modular Invariants for $\widehat{SU}(N)$

Although a complete classification of $\widehat{SU}(N)_k$ modular invariants does not exist, many positive invariants are known[Ber,ALZ,su3,SY1,SY2,dual,Ver]. They include type D invariants that occur for generic k and type E invariants that only occur at particular values of k. D invariants that can be constructed systematically by using properties of automorphisms of the extended Dynkin diagram[Ber,ALZ] or equivalently by the method of simple currents[SY1,SY2] are described in section A.2. E invariants that can be constructed using conformal embeddings are described in section A.3. Other exceptional invariants are described in section A.4.

A.1 Definitions and Notation

The unitary irreducible representations of $\widehat{SU}(N)_k$ are labelled by a highest weight

$$\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} n_i w_i \qquad (hws)$$

where w_i are the $SU(N)$ fundamental weights ($w_i \equiv w_{i+N}, w_N \equiv 0$) and $n_i \geq 0$ are the Dynkin labels. Unitarity imposes the constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} n_i \ \leq k \qquad (uni)$$

The conformal dimension of the primary state labelled by Λ is given by

$$h(\Lambda) = \frac{\Lambda \cdot (\Lambda + 2\rho)}{2(k+N)} \qquad (pc)$$

where ρ is the sum of the fundamental weights. For future reference we also introduce the N^{th}-ality of Λ defined as

$$t(\Lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} i n_i \qquad (tri)$$

t is defined mod N.

The affine algebra has a group of automorphisms with elements $\sigma^r, r = 1, \cdots, N$. σ^r acts on Λ as

$$\sigma^r(\Lambda) = k w_r + a^r(\Lambda) \qquad (aut)$$

where a is the Coxeter rotation belonging to the Weyl group whose action on the fundamental weights is given by

$$a^r(w_i) = w_{i+r} - w_r \qquad (act)$$

σ^r has order $N(r)$ where $N(r)$ is the least integer such that $rN(r) = 0 \bmod N$.

The $\widehat{SU}(N)$ specialized character of the representation with weight Λ is given by [Kac]

$$\chi_\Lambda(\tau) = \frac{1}{\eta^{N^2-1}} \sum_{y \in M} \left[\prod_{\alpha^+} \frac{((k+N) + \Lambda + \rho) \cdot \alpha}{\rho \cdot \alpha} \right] \exp[i\pi(k+N)\tau(y + \frac{\Lambda+\rho}{k+N})^2] \qquad (wk)$$

where η is the Dedekind function and M is the root lattice. We will often denote characters by $\chi_{n_1 n_2 \cdots}$ where n_i are the Dynkin labels. A modular invariant is a combination of characters

$$Z(\tau) = \sum_{\Lambda, \Lambda'} \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda,\Lambda'} \chi_\Lambda(\tau) \chi^*_{\Lambda'}(\tau) \qquad (pfn)$$

that remains invariant under the transformations generated by $\tau \to \tau + 1$ and $\tau \to -1/\tau$. The interpretation of $Z(\tau)$ as a partition function requires that the $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda,\Lambda'}$ be integers and that $\mathcal{N}_{0,0} = 1$. In the next sections we will discuss several types of modular invariant matrices $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda,\Lambda'}$

A.2 Automorphism invariants

In this section we review the type of invariants that can be associated with automorphisms of the affine algebra. We will first discuss the series of invariants constructed by Bernard[Ber] and in the end mention briefly other series that can be built by other methods [ALZ,SY1].

In the Bernard construction an invariant $\mathcal{N}$ can be associated to the automorphism σ^r whenever the quantity

$$j(r) = \frac{1}{2} N(r)(k+N) \frac{r(N-r)}{N} \qquad (jd)$$

satisfies the condition

$$2j(r) \equiv 0 \bmod 2 \text{ and mod } N(r) \qquad (jc)$$

Then there exists a modular invariant $\mathcal{N}^{(r)}$ given by

$$\mathcal{N}^{(r)}_{\Lambda',\Lambda} = \begin{cases} \sum_{p=1}^{N(r)} (-1)^{p[r(N-1)+\frac{2j(r)}{N(r)}]} \delta_{\Lambda', \sigma^{rp}(\Lambda)} & \text{if } t(\Lambda) = j(r) + \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \bmod N(r) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad (binv)$$

We now describe the type of invariants obtained in this way when $N \leq 7$.

When N is an odd prime we can check that, as expected, all values of r are equivalent. In this case condition (jc) is satisfied for $k = 0 \bmod N$ and eq. (binv) yields directly a

positive invariant denoted D. This D-type invariant turns out to be

$$D_{\Lambda',\Lambda} = \begin{cases} \sum_{p=1}^{N} \delta_{\Lambda',\sigma^p(\Lambda)} & \text{if } t(\Lambda) = 0 \text{ mod } N \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad (di)$$

We now consider N even. In this case the situation is more elaborate. In general, there exist invariants when r and N have common factors. For our purposes we only need consider $r = 1, 2, N/2$. When $r = 1$ condition (jc) again requires $k = 0$ mod N. If $k = 0$ mod $2N$ eq.(binv) gives a positive invariant of the above type D. If $k = N$ mod $2N$ eq. (binv) does not give a positive invariant but positivity is restored in the combination $F = \mathcal{N}^{(2)} - \mathcal{N}^{(1)}$. In this way we obtain the F-type invariant

$$F_{\Lambda',\Lambda} = \begin{cases} \sum_{p=1}^{N/2} \delta_{\Lambda',\sigma^{2p}(\Lambda)} & \text{if } t(\Lambda) = 0 \text{ mod } N \\ \sum_{p=1}^{N/2} \delta_{\Lambda',\sigma^{2p-1}(\Lambda)} & \text{if } t(\Lambda) = \frac{N}{2} \text{ mod } N \end{cases} \qquad (finv)$$

By itself $\mathcal{N}^{(2)}$ gives a positive invariant provided $k = 0$ mod $N/2$. In fact, $\mathcal{N}^{(r)}$ gives a positive invariant when r even divides N and $k = 0$ mod N/r. This D_r-type invariant has the form

$$[D_r]_{\Lambda',\Lambda} = \begin{cases} \sum_{p=1}^{N/r} \delta_{\Lambda',\sigma^{rp}(\Lambda)} & \text{if } t(\Lambda) = 0 \text{ mod } N/r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad (dr)$$

Finally we consider $r = N/2$. For $N = 0$ mod 8 and any k, or for $N = 4$ mod 8 and $k = 0$ mod 2, or for $N = 2$ mod 4 and $k = 0$ mod 4, condition (jc) is verified and eq. (binv) yields a positive invariant of type $D_{N/2}$. If $N = 4$ mod 8, $k = 1$ mod 2 or $N = 2$ mod 4, $k = 2$ mod 4 condition (jc) is also verified but $\mathcal{N}$ is non positive. Positivity is restored by subtracting the diagonal invariant. In this way we obtain the G-type invariant

$$G_{\Lambda',\Lambda} = \begin{cases} \delta_{\Lambda',\Lambda} & \text{if } t(\Lambda) = 0 \text{ mod } 2 \\ \delta_{\Lambda',\sigma^{N/2}(\Lambda)} & \text{if } t(\Lambda) = 1 \text{ mod } 2 \end{cases} \qquad (gi)$$

Table 2 gives the different invariant types for $N \leq 7$ according to the above discussion.

There exist other series of invariants associated with automorphisms (or simple currents) that are not included in the Bernard construction[ALZ,SY1]. For instance, for $\widehat{SU}(3)$, $k \neq 0$ mod 3, there is an invariant of the form

$$\sum_{all\ orbits\ of\ \sigma} |\chi_{\Lambda_0}|^2 + \chi_{\Lambda_1}\chi^*_{\Lambda_2} + \chi_{\Lambda_2}\chi^*_{\Lambda_1} \qquad (raros)$$

where $t(\Lambda_0) = 0$ mod 3 and $\Lambda_i = \sigma^i(\Lambda_0)$. In our analysis of coset compactifications we did not consider this type of invariants in order to reduce the number of models.

A.3 Conformal Embeddings

An affine algebra $\hat{\bar{G}}$ at level $\bar{k}$ is conformally embedded into $\hat{G}$ at level k if $\bar{G} \subset G$ and their central charges are equal. All conformal embeddings have been classified[emb] and shown to require $k = 1$. Table 3 displays the embeddings of $\widehat{SU}(N)$, $N = 3, \cdots, 7$ into simple algebras.

When $\hat{\bar{G}}$ is conformally embedded into $\hat{G}$ a character χ_Λ of $\hat{G}$ can be written as a finite sum of characters $\bar{\chi}_{\bar{\Lambda}}$ of $\hat{\bar{G}}$ for which

$$h(\Lambda) = h(\bar{\Lambda}) \mod \text{integer} \qquad (hc)$$

To determine the branching rule of Λ the first step is to find the states $\bar{\Lambda}$ satisfying condition (hc). Next, the asymptotic behavior of χ_Λ is matched with that of an appropriate combination of $\chi_{\bar{\Lambda}}$'s [Kac]. Finally, the first terms in the expansion of the characters in powers of $q = \exp(2i\pi\tau)$ are compared.

From the above discussion it is clear that modular invariants for $\hat{\bar{G}}$ can be computed from invariants of $\hat{G}$ at level 1. For instance, the E_6 and E_8 invariants of $\widehat{SU}(2)$ can be derived in this way[BN]. Invariants of $\widehat{SU}(3)$ have been obtained in Ref. [su3]. Invariants of $\widehat{SU}(4)_4$ and $\widehat{SU}(5)_5$ were found in Ref. [SY2]. We have derived those of $\widehat{SU}(4)_{6,8}$, $\widehat{SU}(5)_7$, $\widehat{SU}(6)_6$ and $\widehat{SU}(7)_7$ that are relevant to our analysis. These are all collected below. They

are denoted by $C(N-1,k)$ or $\tilde{C}(N-1,k)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(2,5) =&|\chi_{00}+\chi_{22}|^2+|\chi_{20}+\chi_{23}|^2+|\chi_{02}+\chi_{32}|^2+\\
&|\chi_{30}+\chi_{03}|^2+|\chi_{12}+\chi_{50}|^2+|\chi_{21}+\chi_{05}|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
C(2,9) =|\chi_{00}+\chi_{90}+\chi_{09}+\chi_{41}+\chi_{14}+\chi_{44}|^2+2|\chi_{22}+\chi_{25}+\chi_{52}|^2
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(2,21) =&|\chi_{0,0}+\chi_{21,0}+\chi_{0,21}+\chi_{4,4}+\chi_{13,4}+\chi_{4,13}+\\
&\quad\chi_{10,10}+\chi_{10,1}+\chi_{1,10}+\chi_{6,6}+\chi_{9,6}+\chi_{6,9}|^2+\\
&|\chi_{6,0}+\chi_{0,6}+\chi_{15,0}+\chi_{0,15}+\chi_{15,6}+\chi_{6,15}+\\
&\quad\chi_{7,4}+\chi_{4,7}+\chi_{4,10}+\chi_{10,4}+\chi_{10,7}+\chi_{7,10}|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
C(3,4) =|\chi_{000}+\chi_{012}+\chi_{040}+\chi_{210}|^2+|\chi_{004}+\chi_{400}+\chi_{101}+\chi_{121}|^2+4|\chi_{111}|^2
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(3,6) =&|\chi_{000}+\chi_{060}+\chi_{202}+\chi_{222}|^2+|\chi_{006}+\chi_{600}+\chi_{022}+\chi_{220}|^2+\\
&|\chi_{002}+\chi_{240}+\chi_{212}|^2+|\chi_{200}+\chi_{042}+\chi_{212}|^2+\\
&|\chi_{004}+\chi_{420}+\chi_{121}|^2+|\chi_{400}+\chi_{024}+\chi_{121}|^2+\\
&|\chi_{012}+\chi_{230}+\chi_{303}|^2+|\chi_{032}+\chi_{210}+\chi_{303}|^2+\\
&|\chi_{103}+\chi_{321}+\chi_{030}|^2+|\chi_{301}+\chi_{123}+\chi_{030}|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(3,8) =&|\chi_{000}+\chi_{800}+\chi_{080}+\chi_{008}+\chi_{121}+\chi_{412}+\chi_{141}+\chi_{214}|^2+\\
&|\chi_{020}+\chi_{602}+\chi_{060}+\chi_{206}+\chi_{303}+\chi_{230}+\chi_{323}+\chi_{032}|^2+\\
&2|\chi_{113}+\chi_{311}+\chi_{133}+\chi_{331}|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(4,5) =&|\chi_{0000}+\chi_{5000}+\chi_{0500}+\chi_{0050}+\chi_{0005}+\chi_{0102}+\chi_{2010}+\chi_{0220}+\chi_{1022}+\chi_{2201}|^2+\\
&|\chi_{0013}+\chi_{3100}+\chi_{0131}+\chi_{1310}+\chi_{1001}+\chi_{1111}|^2+8|\chi_{1111}|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(4,7) =& |\chi_{0000}+\chi_{0330}+\chi_{0403}+\chi_{2002}+\chi_{2112}+\chi_{3040}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{7000}+\chi_{1033}+\chi_{0040}+\chi_{3200}+\chi_{1211}+\chi_{0304}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{0007}+\chi_{3301}+\chi_{4030}+\chi_{0023}+\chi_{1121}+\chi_{0400}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{0700}+\chi_{0103}+\chi_{3004}+\chi_{2320}+\chi_{2121}+\chi_{0030}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{0070}+\chi_{3010}+\chi_{0300}+\chi_{0232}+\chi_{1212}+\chi_{4003}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{0002}+\chi_{0421}+\chi_{2012}+\chi_{2130}+\chi_{2203}|^2+|\chi_{0312}+\chi_{1240}+\chi_{2000}+\chi_{2102}+\chi_{3022}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{2500}+\chi_{1004}+\chi_{2220}+\chi_{0121}+\chi_{3022}|^2+|\chi_{1210}+\chi_{4001}+\chi_{0052}+\chi_{0222}+\chi_{2203}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{5000}+\chi_{0042}+\chi_{2201}+\chi_{1213}+\chi_{0220}|^2+|\chi_{3121}+\chi_{2400}+\chi_{0005}+\chi_{1022}+\chi_{0220}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{0250}+\chi_{2100}+\chi_{1222}+\chi_{3012}+\chi_{0302}|^2+|\chi_{2103}+\chi_{0012}+\chi_{0520}+\chi_{2221}+\chi_{2030}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{0025}+\chi_{4210}+\chi_{0122}+\chi_{1301}+\chi_{2030}|^2+|\chi_{1031}+\chi_{0124}+\chi_{5200}+\chi_{2210}+\chi_{0302}|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(5,6) =& |\chi_{00000}+\chi_{01002}+\chi_{20010}+\chi_{00014}+\chi_{02020}+\chi_{10112}+\chi_{21101}+\chi_{41000}+\\
& \quad \chi_{00230}+\chi_{01032}+\chi_{03200}+\chi_{11211}+\chi_{23010}+\chi_{00060}+\chi_{01410}+\chi_{06000}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{10001}+\chi_{00103}+\chi_{11011}+\chi_{30100}+\chi_{00006}+\chi_{01121}+\chi_{10023}+\chi_{12110}+\\
& \quad \chi_{20202}+\chi_{32001}+\chi_{60000}+\chi_{00141}+\chi_{02301}+\chi_{10320}+\chi_{14100}+\chi_{00600}|^2+\\
& 16|\chi_{11111}|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{C}(5,6) =& |\chi_{00000}+\chi_{00200}+\chi_{02020}+\chi_{04002}+\chi_{20040}+\chi_{00060}+\chi_{06000}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{00100}+\chi_{01110}+\chi_{03011}+\chi_{11030}+\chi_{05001}+\chi_{10050}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{01010}+\chi_{02101}+\chi_{10120}+\chi_{01040}+\chi_{04010}+\chi_{12021}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{02001}+\chi_{10020}+\chi_{00130}+\chi_{03100}+\chi_{11111}+\chi_{02031}+\chi_{13020}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{00030}+\chi_{03000}+\chi_{11011}+\chi_{01121}+\chi_{12110}+\chi_{20202}+\chi_{03030}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{01021}+\chi_{12010}+\chi_{20102}+\chi_{02120}+\chi_{10212}+\chi_{21201}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{02020}+\chi_{10112}+\chi_{21101}+\chi_{30003}+\chi_{00303}+\chi_{11211}+\chi_{30300}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{00203}+\chi_{11111}+\chi_{20013}+\chi_{30200}+\chi_{31002}+\chi_{01302}+\chi_{20310}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{01202}+\chi_{10104}+\chi_{20210}+\chi_{21012}+\chi_{40101}+\chi_{10401}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{01005}+\chi_{10301}+\chi_{11103}+\chi_{30111}+\chi_{50010}+\chi_{00500}|^2+\\
& |\chi_{00006}+\chi_{00400}+\chi_{02004}+\chi_{20202}+\chi_{40020}+\chi_{60000}+\chi_{00600}|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(6,7) =& |\chi_{000000}+\chi_{010002}+\chi_{200010}+\chi_{000104}+\chi_{020020}+\chi_{101012}+\chi_{210101}+\chi_{401000}+ \\
& \chi_{000007}+\chi_{002030}+\chi_{010122}+\chi_{030200}+\chi_{100024}+\chi_{111111}+\chi_{200203}+\chi_{221010}+ \\
& \chi_{302002}+\chi_{420001}+\chi_{700000}+\chi_{000240}+\chi_{001042}+\chi_{012210}+\chi_{020302}+\chi_{042000}+ \\
& \chi_{101221}+\chi_{122101}+\chi_{203020}+\chi_{240100}+\chi_{000070}+\chi_{002401}+\chi_{010420}+\chi_{024010}+ \\
& \chi_{070000}+\chi_{104200}+\chi_{000700}+\chi_{007000}|^2+ \\
& |\chi_{100001}+\chi_{001003}+\chi_{110011}+\chi_{300100}+\chi_{000015}+\chi_{011021}+\chi_{100113}+\chi_{120110}+ \\
& \chi_{201102}+\chi_{311001}+\chi_{510000}+\chi_{001131}+\chi_{010033}+\chi_{021201}+\chi_{102120}+\chi_{110212}+ \\
& \chi_{131100}+\chi_{212011}+\chi_{330010}+\chi_{000151}+\chi_{003300}+\chi_{011311}+\chi_{033001}+\chi_{100330}+ \\
& \chi_{113110}+\chi_{151000}+\chi_{001510}+\chi_{015100}|^2+32|\chi_{111111}|^2
\end{aligned}
\qquad (coninv)
$$

A.4 E_7-type invariants

E_7-type invariants are those that can be obtained acting with an automorphism of the fusion rules of the extended algebra^{MS}. It has been claimed that they only exist for $N = 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 16$ [Ver,AF]. The $\widehat{SU}(3)_9$ and the $\widehat{SU}(5)_5$ invariants were found in Refs. [MS] and [SY2] respectively. The remaining ones were obtained in Refs. [Ver] and [AF]. Below we list the $N = 3, 4, 5$ invariants that are relevant for our analysis. They are denoted by $E(N-1, k)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(2,9) =& |\chi_{00}+\chi_{90}+\chi_{09}|^2+|\chi_{22}+\chi_{25}+\chi_{52}|^2+|\chi_{44}+\chi_{41}+\chi_{14}|^2+|\chi_{36}+\chi_{60}+\chi_{03}|^2+ \\
& |\chi_{63}+\chi_{06}+\chi_{30}|^2+2|\chi_{33}|^2+[(\chi_{11}+\chi_{17}+\chi_{71})\chi_{33}^*+c.c.]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(3,8) =& |\chi_{000}+\chi_{800}+\chi_{080}+\chi_{008}|^2+|\chi_{400}+\chi_{440}+\chi_{044}+\chi_{004}|^2+ \\
& |\chi_{020}+\chi_{602}+\chi_{060}+\chi_{206}|^2+|\chi_{024}+\chi_{202}+\chi_{420}+\chi_{242}|^2+ \\
& |\chi_{032}+\chi_{303}+\chi_{230}+\chi_{323}|^2+|\chi_{311}+\chi_{331}+\chi_{133}+\chi_{113}|^2+ \\
& |\chi_{121}+\chi_{412}+\chi_{141}+\chi_{214}|^2+|\chi_{040}+\chi_{404}|^2+2|\chi_{222}|^2+ \\
& [(\chi_{012}+\chi_{501}+\chi_{250}+\chi_{125})\chi_{222}^*+(\chi_{210}+\chi_{521}+\chi_{052}+\chi_{105})\chi_{222}^*+ \\
& (\chi_{101}+\chi_{610}+\chi_{161}+\chi_{016})(\chi_{040}+\chi_{404})^*+c.c.]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(4,5) =& |\chi_{0000}+\chi_{5000}+\chi_{0500}+\chi_{0050}+\chi_{0005}|^2+|\chi_{0102}+\chi_{2010}+\chi_{0220}+\chi_{1022}+\chi_{2201}|^2+ \\
& |\chi_{0110}+\chi_{3011}+\chi_{0301}+\chi_{1030}+\chi_{1103}|^2+|\chi_{1200}+\chi_{2120}+\chi_{0212}+\chi_{0021}+\chi_{2002}|^2+ \\
& [(\chi_{1001}+\chi_{3100}+\chi_{1310}+\chi_{0131}+\chi_{0013})\chi_{1111}^*+c.c]+4|\chi_{1111}|^2
\end{aligned}
\qquad (einv)
$$

REFERENCES

Gepner89. D. Gepner, Phys. Lett. B222 (1989) 207.

G3. D. Gepner, "String theory on Calabi-Yau manifolds: the three generation case", Princeton Univ. preprint PUPT-88-0085 (1988).

GepnerW. D. Gepner, Nucl. Phys. B322 (1989) 65

Gepner87. D. Gepner, Nucl. Phys. B 296 (1988) 757; Phys. Lett. B199 (1987) 380.

FIQS. A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez, F. Quevedo and A. Sierra, Nucl. Phys. B337 (1989) 119.

Fuchs. J. Fuchs, A. Klemm, C. Scheich and M. Schmidt, Phys. Lett. B232 (1989) 232; Ann. Phys. 204 (1990) 1.

Kazama. Y. Kazama and H. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. B321 (1989) 232.

Font. A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. B217 (1989) 271.

LVW. W. Lerche, C. Vafa and N.P. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B324 (1989) 427.

GVW. B. Greene, C. Vafa and N.P. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B324 (1989) 371.

Mar. E. Martinec, Phys. Lett. B217 (1989) 431.

schya. A.N. Schellekens and S. Yankielowicz, Nucl. Phys. B330, (1990) 103.

Lutken. A. Lütken and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B213 (1988) 512.

Bailin. D. Bailin, D.C. Dunbar and A. Love, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A6 (1991) 1659.

But1. E. Buturovic, Phys. Lett. B236 (1990) 277.

But2. E. Buturovic, Nucl. Phys. B352 (1991) 163.

VW. C. Vafa and N.P. Warner, Phys. Lett. B218 (1989) 51.

Vafa. C. Vafa, Mod. Phys. Lett. A4 (1989) 1169.

LS1. M. Lynker and R. Schimmrigk, Nucl. Phys. B339 (1990) 121.

LS2. M. Lynker and R. Schimmrigk, Phys. Lett. B253 (1991) 83.

Sche. A.N. Schellekens, "Field identification fixed points in $N = 2$ coset theories", preprint CERN-TH.6055/91 (1991).

Schwarz. J.H. Schwarz, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A4 (1989) 2653.

Capelli. A. Capelli, C. Itzykson and J.B. Zuber, Nucl. Phys. B280 (1987) 445.

Ber. D. Bernard, Nucl. Phys. B288 (1987) 628.

ALZ. D. Altschuler, J. Lacki and P. Zaugg, Phys. Lett. B205 (1988) 281.

SY1. A.N. Schellekens and S. Yankielowicz, Nucl. Phys. B327 (1989) 673; Phys. Lett. B227 (1989) 387.

SY2. A.N. Schellekens and S. Yankielowicz, Nucl. Phys. B334 (1990) 67; Int. J. Mod. Phys. A5 (1990) 2903.

Ver. D. Verstegen, Nucl. Phys. B346 (1990) 349; Comm. Math. Phys. 137 (1991) 567.

su3. P. Christe and F. Ravanini, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A4 (1989) 897;
M. Bauer and C.Itzykson, Comm. Math. Phys. 127 (1990) 617.

dual. M. Walton, Nucl. Phys. B322 (1989) 775;
D. Altschuler, M. Bauer and C. Itzykson, Comm. Math. Phys. 132 (1990) 349.

MS. G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B313 (1988) 16.

BN. P. Bouwknegt and W. Nahm, Phys. Lett. B184 (1987) 359.

emb. A.N. Schellekens and N.P. Warner. Phys. Rev. D34 (1986) 3092;
F. Bais and P. Bouwknegt, Nucl. Phys. B279 (1987) 561;
R. Arcuri, J. Gomes and D. Olive, Nucl. Phys. B285 (1987) 327.

AF. A. Font, "Automorphism fixed points and exceptional modular invariants", preprint FERMILAB-PUB-91/229-T.

Kac. V.G. Kac, *Infinite Dimensional Lie Algebras* (Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Arnold. V.I. Arnold, S.M. Gusein-Zade and A.N. Varchenko, *Singularities of Differentiable Maps*, vol.I, (Birkhauser, 1985).

N	k	Invariant
3,5,7	0 mod N	D
2	0 mod 4	D
	2 mod 4	F
4	0 mod 8	D, D_2
	4 mod 8	F, D_2
	2 mod 4	D_2
	1 mod 2	G
6	0 mod 12	D
	6 mod 12	F
	0 mod 3	D_2
	0 mod 4	D_3
	2 mod 4	G

TABLE 2. Bernard invariants for $N \leq 7$.

$\bar{G}$	G	$\bar{k}$	Invariant
$SU(3)$	$SO(8)$	3	D
	$SU(6)$	5	$C(2,5)$
	E_6	9	$C(2,9)$
	E_7	21	$C(2,21)$
$SU(4)$	$SU(6)$	2	D_2
	$SO(15)$	4	$C(3,4)$
	$SU(10)$	6	$C(3,6)$
	$SO(20)$	8	$C(3,8)$
$SU(5)$	$SU(10)$	3	$C(4,3)$
	$SO(24)$	5	$C(4,5)$
	$SU(15)$	7	$C(4,7)$
$SU(6)$	$SU(15)$	4	$C(5,4)$
	$SO(35)$	6	$C(5,6)$
	$Sp(20)$	6	$\tilde{C}(5,6)$
	$SU(21)$	8	$C(5,8)$
$SU(7)$	$SU(21)$	5	$C(6,5)$
	$SO(48)$	7	$C(6,7)$
	$SU(28)$	9	$C(6,9)$

TABLE 3. Conformal embeddings of $\widehat{SU}(N)$, $N = 3, \cdots, 7$ into simple groups.